

Philippines and supervising elections in Nicaragua. After working for Col. George Marshall, Ridgway led the first major airborne division operation through Italy and later through France on D-Day. During the Korean conflict, Ridgway was elevated to four commands simultaneously—supreme commander for the allied powers in Japan, United States commander-in-chief for Korea and commanding general of the United States Army in the Far East. In 1952, he relieved Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as supreme commander of allied forces in Europe.

Standing alone behind German lines near Ste. Mere Eglise, he saw a shadow looming nearby, as General Ridgway told the story, and pulled his sidearm. He said the division's codeword, "Thunder" and strained to hear the countersign, "Flash." There was no response. Ridgway tensed. The object moved and Ridgway realized it was a cow.

"I could have kissed her," he said.

Experiences like these, and the willingness to share them, are indicative of the kind of person Ridgway was. He felt that comradeship and good morale was essential for the troops fighting in the battle fields. The General demonstrated this leadership in Korea by touring the front lines and sharing the miserable conditions of snow, sleet, mud that American soldiers had to survive.

General Ridgway earned numerous medals and honors including the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1991, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star Medal, and the Bronze Star Medal. In 1991, Army Gen. Colin Powell, the current Joint Chiefs Chairman, presented General Ridgway with the Congressional Gold Medal. What meant more to him, however, was that General Powell also awarded him with the Combat Infantryman's Badge worn by thousands of foot soldiers during World War II. Traditionally, this medal was awarded to soldiers who had served 90 days of combat, but not to officers above the rank of lieutenant colonel. This medal, above all of them, best exemplified the kind of military man he was. An officer who didn't ask a soldier to do anything he wasn't willing to do himself.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway was a real soldier in a time when a soldier knew the clearly defined goals and could be more certain of his ability to achieve them. Pittsburgh was honored to have a true hero in its city and will feel this loss for years to come. He will be forever identified with the great military leaders of this century and as a great American who devoted his life to his country.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. ERIC FINGERHUT**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1993

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in my district, I was not present during the House session on Monday, July 26. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 1757, the National Information Infrastructure Act, and "yes" on House Resolution 188, expressing the sense of the House that the Olympics in the year 2000 should not be held in China.

#### REINVENTING GOVERNMENT: MAKING THE "WET" SIDE OF NOAA WORK BETTER

**HON. JOLENE UNSOELD**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1993

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Ocean and Coastal Management Improvement Act of 1993 in an effort to support the administration's initiative to make Government work better. My bill would transfer some of the wet programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] from the Department of Commerce to the Department of the Interior and others to the new Department of Environmental Protection.

As clearly evidenced by its name, NOAA has two distinct, though not uncomplementary, missions. However, in recent years, the balance between the wet and dry sides of NOAA has been skewed by a troubling trend of increasing funding for satellite and weather functions at the expense of ocean, coastal, and fisheries [OCF] programs.

The Reagan and Bush years were not good ones for the marine programs of the agency. In fiscal year 1980, OCF programs comprised 46 percent of the NOAA budget; this dropped to a low of 22 percent in the fiscal year 1989 budget request. In the last few years, the Bush administration did a slightly better job in its request for OCF programs with increases in fiscal year 1991 and thereafter, although none exceeded the value of the last Carter request in 1980, adjusted for inflation. Presidential requests for the dry side of the agency, in contrast, have consistently outpaced inflation since 1984.

Although allowances must be given to the Clinton-Gore administration in assembling its first budget, it continued this trend in the fiscal year 1994 budget request which sought an increase of 26 percent for the National Weather Service and the National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service while the request for oceanic programs was below current funding levels.

Congress has historically tried to fight the tide of reductions in OCF programs and has consistently raised appropriations over requested levels, although at modest levels. I would like to point out to my colleagues that last week the Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary brought to the House floor a bill that, for fiscal year 1994, begins to restore some of the past losses in oceans programs, moving them more in the direction of authorization levels. The defeat in the House, by an overwhelming vote of 70-356, of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to cut wet side programs certainly helped in this regard. I would like to commend Chairman NATCHER and Subcommittee Chairman NEAL SMITH, for their fine work on that bill and, in particular, for the additional assistance provided for NOAA's ocean, coastal, and fisheries programs.

Nevertheless, the serious erosion of funding for our OCF programs over the years cannot be constantly turned around by congressional action or rectified by a single appropriations bill, however meritorious. The fact is that the fundamental problem is institutional, that is,

the way the executive branch is organized with respect to such programs.

The cumulative effect of the reductions in oceans programs since the early 1980's has been calculated at a loss of over \$900 million in funding for OCF programs. Because of this lost funding, NOAA has a backlog of research, resource management, and monitoring needs. Moreover, the agency has only about 94 percent of its 1980 spending power for OCF programs. As a result, neither the backlog of addressing ecosystem degradation nor the new problems caused by ever increasing demands on coastal and marine resources are being addressed.

I firmly believe that this trend must not be allowed to continue and, in fact, must be reversed. I believe that my bill will take the first step—a significant step—in achieving this reversal.

For the sake of governmental efficiency and economy, this realignment seeks to match like functions between the sister agencies. For instance, my bill would blend the responsibilities of NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service and the National Marine Sanctuary Program with those of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, it would direct other programs to the Office of the Secretary—NOAA fleet and NOAA Corps, the U.S. Geological Survey—mapping, charting, and the new National Biological Survey—research, sea grant, at the Interior Department. Finally, the bill would turn NOAA's coastal management, estuarine, and coastal pollution programs over to an Assistant Secretary at the Department of Environmental Protection.

This legislation would accomplish several goals. First, it would remove primarily environmental programs from the cabinet department tasked with business and trade promotion. Second, it would transfer critical ocean, coastal, and fisheries responsibilities to a more compatible location where they would no longer be ignored and for which the budget process of the Office of Management and Budget would be more rational. And third, a reorganization should enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of both the recipient and donor department thereby increasing the likelihood that adequate funding will be made available for the transferred functions.

Finally, I would simply note that the placement of NOAA in the Department of Commerce in 1970 was, in a very real sense, a starkly political decision. Many members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and outside ocean policy specialists wanted the agency to be independent. Secretary of the Interior Hickel thought that it was going to his department. But, through a combination of Hickel's public criticism of the Vietnam war and the intervention of Attorney General John Mitchell, NOAA was given to President Nixon's chief fundraiser and Secretary of Commerce, Maurice Stans. The time has come, in my judgment, to place the oceans programs in more appropriate and compatible agencies and to correct the political deal of 1970.

I have included with this statement a summary of the Ocean and Coastal Management Improvement Act of 1993.

#### OCEAN AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1993—SUMMARY

Transfers "wet" offices of NOAA to Department of the Interior and the new Department of Environmental Protection:

Transfer of some NOAA "wet" offices (and their functions) to the Department of the Interior:

From the National Ocean Service:  
National Marine Fisheries Service and the Marine Sanctuary Program are delegated to the Fish and Wildlife Service;

Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy activities are delegated to U.S. Geological Survey;

Coastal Ocean Science functions are delegated to the new National Biological Survey.

From the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research:

Oceans and Great Lakes Programs, Marine prediction research, Sea Grant, and the undersea research programs are delegated to the National Biological Survey.

From NOAA Program Support:

The NOAA fleet of research and survey vessels; and

The NOAA Corps are delegated directly to the Secretary of the Interior who shall determine where in the organizational structure of the Department they should be placed.

Transfer of other NOAA "wet" offices (and their functions) to the new Department of Environmental Protection:

From the National Ocean Service:  
Observation and Assessment functions;  
Estuarine and Coastal Assessment functions;

Coastal Zone Management Program;  
Estuarine Reserve Research System;  
Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program.

The Secretary of the Environment shall designate an Assistant Secretary to be responsible for administering these programs.

The bill includes administrative provisions to transfer advisory committees, property, records, and personnel; savings provisions to protect the status of legal documents, lawsuits, proceedings; reference sections to change federal law from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretaries of the Interior or the Environment and Department of Commerce or NOAA to Departments of the Interior or Environmental Protection, as appropriate.

Under the bill, the transferred NOAA offices would line up in their new agencies as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary;  
NOAA fleet of research and survey vessels; and  
NOAA Corps.  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:  
The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); and  
The Marine Sanctuary Program.  
U.S. Geological Survey:  
Mapping;  
Charting; and  
Geodesy functions.  
National Biological Survey:  
Coastal Ocean Science;  
Oceans and Great Lakes Programs;  
Marine Prediction Research;  
National Sea Grant College Program; and  
The Undersea Research Program.

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

To an Assistant Secretary designated by the Secretary of the Environment:  
Observation and Assessment functions;  
Estuarine and Coastal Assessment functions;  
Coastal Zone Management Program;  
Estuarine Reserve Research System; and  
Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Program.

## THE C-17 FILES INTO HEAVY FLAK

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1993

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as the Armed Services Committee begins the process of marking up the 1994 Defense authorization bill, all of us are preparing to vote on how we should best allocate our limited resources for the Nation's defense.

Over the past 2 years, the Committee on Government Operations, which I chair, has repeatedly examined the financially and technically troubled Air Force C-17 Airlifter Program, which is fast proving to be one of the most troubled procurements in our Nation's history.

In its budget submissions, the Pentagon is seeking over \$2 billion for the C-17, and the program's supporters are readying a lobbying blitz to win full funding for purchase of 120 C-17's, no matter what the cost.

Recently an excellent column by David Evans appeared in the Chicago Tribune. Mr. Evans cogently describes the lengths to which McDonnell Douglas and its subcontractors will go to save the C-17 program.

Mr. Evans has discovered that the POW bracelet, which evoked so much emotion from many Americans during the Vietnam war, is now being exploited by a subcontractor to advertise the C-17 to every Member of Congress. The bracelet, which in years gone by carried the name of a missing or captured American serviceman, now proclaims, "Preserve Our Freedom—C-17."

In addition, Mr. Evans reports new data that cast serious doubts upon C-17 supporters' claims about the aircraft's highly touted short field landing capability. It appears that in the landing charts from the C-17 flight manual, there is not a single combination of airplane weight, temperature, or field altitude which shows 3,000-foot landing-takeoff capability.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our constituents to consider the facts and not be swayed by emotional plays like the recycled POW bracelets. If we have a true concern for the well-being of our service men and women, then we should make sure the plans they fly in are safe and efficient.

I ask that the enclosed article, "Push Is On To Save The Troubled C-17, From Heavy Flak" by David Evans, be placed in the RECORD, and I strongly urge my colleagues to study it carefully before we take final action on this troubled program.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 23, 1993]

PUSH IS ON TO SAVE THE TROUBLED C-17

FROM HEAVY FLAK

(By David Evans)

WASHINGTON.—The shiny aluminum bracelet looks much like those worn during the Vietnam War era to remind us of our prisoners and missing-in-action, but this one, the 1993 model, was emblazoned with a picture of the C-17 jet transport and the call to "Preserve Our Freedom."

"Preserve Our Program" might have been a more appropriate slogan, since the bracelets were sent to every member of Congress in hopes of shoring up support for an Air Force program that is faring badly in the Pentagon budget war.

The bracelets were produced by Gloria Coppin, owner and president of a small com-

pany in Chateworth, Calif., that manufactures parts for the C-17.

"I have a vested interest, but I'm also an emotional, patriot-type and I believe very sincerely" in the C-17 program, she said in a telephone interview.

Coppin claims she started the whole POW-bracelet movement during the Vietnam War. Since then, she inherited ownership of her late husband's company, which is one of hundreds of subcontractors feeding C-17 components to the prime contractor, McDonnell Douglas.

The program is in trouble. Top Pentagon officials have slated a key meeting for August, at which they just might decide to cancel the C-17 outright. There is restive talk in Congress about stopping the \$40 billion program well short of the 120 planes the Air Force wants to buy.

The company recently distributed a glossy folder—dubbed "the political atlas" by one Senate aide—featuring maps showing the number of companies and the dollar value of C-17 work in each state. These maps had the same effect as a scratch-and-sniff advertisement, in this case offering the deep aroma of pork.

However, this late-June effort was just part of an orchestrated marketing campaign.

Coppin recounted that three weeks ago worried McDonnell Douglas officials arranged for a nationwide telephone conference with their loyal suppliers.

"They talked about a letter-writing campaign to let Congress know how you feel" about the C-17 program, Coppin recalled. One is reminded that a sinking ship blows all its whistles.

To save the C-17, Coppin decided to further exploit the POW bracelet concept. She produced 1,000 of the C-17 bracelets, and packaged them for shipment to Congress and to a list of her company's suppliers and customers, with a card urging recipients to "please wear this bracelet to help remind all Americans to write or call their elected officials urging them to retain the C-17."

The card also explained that "millions of dollars and man-hours already have been spent perfecting the C-17 as the only means to make every area in the world accessible for defense or humanitarian needs." This part of the message was a pointed reference to the C-17's proclaimed ability to land and take off on dirt airstrips just 3,000 feet long.

However, the first C-17 recently delivered to the Air Force isn't capable of operating on 3,000-foot runways, according to the takeoff and landing tables in the airplane's flight manual.

The heavier the plane, the higher the altitude of the runway and the hotter the temperature, the more length is required. There is not a single combination of airplane weight, temperature or field altitude in these tables that yields a 3,000-foot capability.

For example, a C-17 combat-loaded with its advertised 66-ton payload, plus a one-quarter load of fuel, landing on a hot day at, say, Mogadishu airport in Somalia, which is at sea level, requires a 6,500-foot runway.

As the sportscaster says, let's go to Denver: same C-17 landing weight, but now on a cool day, on a runway a mile above sea level. Required length: 7,000 feet.

Under controlled test conditions, a C-17 did land in 2,800 feet in April, but that was with just a token fuel and cargo load. However, in a landing test in March, a C-17 banked sharply into an unexpected stall and came within about 20 seconds of crashing.

Until further testing is completed, Air Force pilots are being told to fly faster in their landing approaches ("add 10 knots for the wife and kids") to avoid stalling the air-